

<p align="center">5 HANDWRITING EXAMINATIONS</p>	<p align="center">Page 1 of 3</p>
<p align="center">Division of Forensic Science</p> <p align="center">QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS PROCEDURES MANUAL</p>	<p align="center">Amendment Designator:</p>
	<p align="center">Effective Date: 1-April-2003</p>
<p align="center">5 HANDWRITING EXAMINATIONS</p> <p>5.1 Objective</p> <p>To determine whether or not two or more handwritten items were prepared by the same writer.</p> <p>5.2 References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Osborn, A.S.; <u>Questioned Documents</u> (Second Edition); Boyd Printing Company, 1929 Morris, Ron N.; <u>Forensic Handwriting Identification</u>; Academic Press, 2000 Huber, Roy A. & Headrick, A.M.; <u>Handwriting Identification: Facts and Fundamentals</u>; CRC Press, 1999 Conway, James V.P.; <u>Evidential Documents</u>; Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1959 Harrison, Wilson R.; <u>Suspect Documents</u> (Second Edition); Sweet & Maxwell Ltd., 1966 Ellen, David; <u>The Scientific Examination of Documents</u> (Second Edition); Taylor & Francis Ltd., 1997 Hilton, Ordway; <u>Scientific Examination of Questioned Documents</u> (Revised Edition); Elsevier, 1982 <p>5.3 Equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stereo microscope Magnifier Light Source <p>5.4 Procedures</p> <p>5.4.1 These procedures may not address all aspects of any uncommon or unusual circumstances encountered during examinations.</p> <p>5.4.2 All of the following steps may not be possible or necessary in every case.</p> <p>5.4.3 This examination is commonly referred to as a ‘Comparative Handwriting Examination’, but in actuality covers the examination of any item written by hand (e.g. cursive writing, hand printing, signatures, and numerals). The approach to a handwriting problem can vary depending upon the case; however, the examination will generally include the following steps (not necessarily in this sequence):</p> <p>5.4.3.1 Examine the questioned item(s) in order to assess any significance relative to quantity and quality, and to determine the presence (or absence) of any potential identifying qualities. If multiple questioned items exist, cross-compare in order to determine to the extent possible whether all are of common authorship, or whether there is evidence of multiple writers.</p> <p>5.4.3.2 Examine the known material in order to assess any significance relative to quantity and quality, as well as comparability to the questioned item(s). Cross-compare all of the known items in order to assess the particular writer’s range of variation (syn. range of writing), and to verify to the extent possible that all of the known items were prepared by the same writer. Any question or possible discrepancy regarding authorship of items submitted as ‘known’ (or portions thereof) must be resolved before the affected portions can be included in any side-by-side comparison with the questioned material.</p>	

5 HANDWRITING EXAMINATIONS	Page 2 of 3
<div>Division of Forensic Science</div> <div>QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS PROCEDURES MANUAL</div>	Amendment Designator:
	Effective Date: 1-April-2003
<p>5.4.3.3 Conduct side-by-side comparison of the questioned and known items in an effort to determine whether the features and characteristics displayed within the questioned item(s) are represented within the range of variation of the known items, and whether there are any significant recurring dissimilarities. Applying established principles of handwriting identification, evaluate the significance and relative individuality of the comparable writing characteristics, and reach a conclusion within any limitations imposed by the particular nature of the evidence.</p> <p>5.5 Reporting Conclusions</p> <p>5.5.1 The term ‘Indications’ (with or without modification) shall be used to express less than definitive (qualified) conclusions in Certificates of Analysis.</p> <p>5.5.2 An ‘Indications’ finding may be further modified with the terms ‘limited’ or ‘strong’, as appropriate.</p> <p>5.5.3 Conclusions appearing in Certificates of Analysis shall conform to one of the following.</p> <p>5.5.3.1 <u>Wrote (made, prepared)</u> - An unqualified identification. The agreement between the significant features of the questioned and known material is such that the examiner is absolutely certain both must have been prepared by the same writer. EXAMPLE: Smith wrote the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p>5.5.3.2 <u>Strong Indications Wrote</u> - A qualified conclusion wherein the examiner is virtually, yet not absolutely, certain the writer of the known material prepared the questioned writing. There is excellent agreement between the significant features of the questioned and known material, but in the opinion of the examiner it falls short of that which is required to reach an unqualified identification. The possibility of other writer involvement is considered extremely remote. EXAMPLE: There are strong indications Smith wrote the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p>5.5.3.3 <u>Indications Wrote</u> – A qualified conclusion appropriate when there is good agreement between the significant features of the questioned and known material. The possibility of other writer involvement is considered very unlikely. EXAMPLE: There are indications Smith wrote the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p>5.5.3.4 <u>Limited Indications Wrote</u> – A qualified conclusion appropriate when there is some agreement between the significant features of the questioned and known material. The agreement is greater than what would normally be expected to occur in random writings as a matter of mere coincidence, and the possibility of other writer involvement is considered unlikely. EXAMPLE: There are limited indications Smith wrote the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p>5.5.3.5 <u>Can Be Neither Identified Nor Eliminated</u> – For any of a number of reasons, the examiner was unable to locate adequate significant features pointing toward or away from the writer under consideration, and could not reach any conclusion regarding authorship of the questioned writings. The examiner is essentially stating, “I don’t know.” EXAMPLE: Smith can be neither identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p>5.5.3.6 <u>Limited Indications Did Not Write</u> – A qualified conclusion appropriate when there are some significant dissimilarities between the features of the questioned and known material. The possibility that both were prepared by the same writer is considered unlikely. EXAMPLE: There are limited indications Smith did not make the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p>5.5.3.7 <u>Indications Did Not Write</u> – A qualified conclusion appropriate when there are many significant dissimilarities between the features of the questioned and known writing. The possibility that both were prepared by the same writer is considered very unlikely. EXAMPLE: There are indications Smith did not write the questioned signature on Item 1.</p>	

<p align="center">5 HANDWRITING EXAMINATIONS</p>	<p align="center">Page 3 of 3</p>
<p align="center">Division of Forensic Science</p> <p align="center">QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS PROCEDURES MANUAL</p>	<p>Amendment Designator:</p>
	<p>Effective Date: 1-April-2003</p>
<p>5.5.3.8 <u>Strong Indications Did Not Write</u> – A qualified conclusion appropriate when the significant dissimilarities between the features of the questioned and known material are such that the examiner is virtually certain the writer of the known material did not prepare the questioned writing. The possibility that both were prepared by the same writer is considered extremely remote. EXAMPLE: There are strong indications Smith did not write the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p>5.5.3.9 <u>Did Not Write</u> – An unqualified elimination. Appropriate when the significant dissimilarities between the features of the questioned and known material are to the extent that the examiner can reach absolute certainty that both must have been prepared by different writers. EXAMPLE: Smith did not write the questioned signature on Item 1.</p> <p align="right">◆End</p>	